Comments of Colombia on Costa Rica’s Reply of 22 October 2010 to the question posed by Judge Bennouna on 15 October 2010

1. Costa Rica states that it “has postponed ratification of the Treaty of 17 March 1977 pending the Court’s judgment on the merits in the case Nicaragua and Colombia”.1 Notwithstanding the Treaty’s non-ratification, the fact is that Costa Rica has complied with it since the date of its conclusion. Costa Rica confirms this when it says “that it has complied in good faith with the 1977 Treaty, that it will continue to do so, and that it does not seek any particular outcome from this case in relation to this Treaty.”2

2. During the hearing, Costa Rica expressly agreed with this, referring to the fact that “Costa Rica has obligations vis-à-vis Colombia related to the 1977 line and the treaty from which that line arose”,3 and to Costa Rica’s “international obligations, in particular the Treaty of 1977 with the Republic of Colombia”.4

3. Moreover, the 1980 Treaty between Costa Rica and Panama, which has been ratified by Costa Rica, recognized the 1977 boundary by stipulating that the Costa Rica-Panama boundary extended to a point “where the boundaries of Costa Rica, Colombia and Panama intersect”.

4. No State has objected to the boundary situation established by the 1977 Treaty. That situation has contributed to stability and certainty in the area amongst all concerned States. In the oral hearings, Costa Rica affirmed its commitment to abide by the 1977 Treaty and to preserve its long-standing neighboring relationship with Colombia,5 a position that Colombia fully shares.

The Hague, 29 October 2010.
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Agent of the Republic of Colombia
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1 Costa Rica Reply to Judge Bennouna’s question (hereafter CRR), 22 Oct. 2010, para. 3.
2 CRR, para. 7.
3 “Counsel for Nicaragua discussed the 1977 line at great length apparently in order to demonstrate that Costa Rica has obligations vis-à-vis Colombia related to the 1977 line and the treaty from which that line arose. Costa Rica does not contest this.” CR 2010/15, 14 Oct. 2010, p. 28, para. 13 (Lathrop).
5 CR 2010/15, 14 Oct. 2010, p. 15, para. 13 (Lathrop); p. 28, para. 9 (Agent).